

Date: Thu, 20 May 93 07:06:32 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #157
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 20 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 157

Today's Topics:

11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
 High speed Morse code requirement
 Morse et cetera... (2 msgs)
 No-Code Stupidity (2 msgs)
 Put up or Shut up! (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 20 May 93 02:51:54 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

> I guess you don't read 73. Wayne claims high speed Morse causes brain
> damage, thus Morsely impaired refers to high speed Morse addicts.

And some people say listening to Wayne Green causes brain damage.

--Robert

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 09:22:30 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: High speed Morse code requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May19.185649.13852@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <VBREault.93May18175328@rinhp750.gmr.com> vbreault@rinhp750.gmr.com
(Val Breault) writes:

>>I will mention "Morse code" and "high speed Morse code".

>>Please note that they are intentionally different.

>

>I personally think that the 20 wpm exam is also somewhat silly, given the
>reductions in service use. If we're looking for ways to compress the number
>of licenses, the 5 and 13 exams should do just fine. It would also be nice
>if Part 97 was a bit more specific in terms of what constitutes copying CW
>at a certain rate.

5 and 13 just require effort, lots more effort for some than others, but
20+ requires inborn talent that some people will never have. Not everyone
can be Chet Atkins or Ronnie Millsap. (Both good CW men I hear.)

If CW is to serve as an "effort" filter, then it should be possible for
anyone to succeed via effort alone. If it's just an exclusion filter for
the rhythm impaired, then it's discriminatory on a basic human level,
no better than the color line.

I think it's in fact an irrelevant filter, and more relevant filtering
systems could be used if filtering is a goal, but that's what this thread
is about.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 17:58:53 CDT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!
unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Morse et cetera...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dana@atlas.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>
> Robert, I *am* an Extra, and I think the 13 and 20 WPM tests are no
> longer relevant to licensing. How are you going to refute me?
>

All Extras don't think alike, Dana, just as all Codeless Technicians are of the same philosophy. Haven't you figured that out by now?

--Robert

Date: Wed, 19 May 93 18:11:57 CDT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!
amanda!robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Morse et cetera...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dana@spica.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

> Please do not presume to speak for me. "In the eyes of the group", indeed!
>
<yawn> Maybe I didn't make myself clear with my last post. I'll repeat my response one more time, just for your benifit. All Extras do not think alike, just as all Codeless Technicians do not have the same philosophy.

Have a nice day.

--Robert

Date: Thu, 20 May 93 00:28:24 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-Code Stupidity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:

> And MOST of us in this group are tired of your pro-code whining. Discussion
Have you ever bothered to READ some of the "anti-code" posts, Tom?
> Don't even bother flaming.

Hate to disappoint you, Tom, but none of my posts are "flames," just

my opinion. There are just too many of the "welfare-mentality" who believe that they should get something for nothing.

Have a nice day.

--Robert

Date: Thu, 20 May 93 03:11:07 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-Code Stupidity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

> My point is that CW is no longer as important to achieving the goals
> of the Amateur Radio Service as it was when the Amateur Radio Service
> was established. I've been suggesting that CW be de-emphasized in the
> licensing procedure. I've suggested that alternatives be provided
> to the 13 and 20 WPM tests, such as specialized written exams which
> verify an amateur has developed some skill past the norm. I've refuted
> claims that the current CW requirements "keep the riff-raff out".
>
> So, what is so obnoxious about this?

A suggestion, along Dana's lines: Delete the 20 wpm requirement, and replace it with 13 wpm (for Extra only). Modify the Novice to duplicate the current Codeless Technician, meaning the Novice will be the "entry level" ticket. The Technician will remain the same as the "old" Tech (meaning the new Tech Plus). On General and Advanced, the Morse requirement would be reduced to 5 wpm.

That was the sugar...and now the medicine.

All question pools would be deleted. In other words, no longer can one "buy" the exact questions and answers, take and pass the written exam, and learn nothing in the process. To those hams who remember how it was in the "old days," the FCC gave the tests and there was no such thing as question pools as we know them today. You learned the "right stuff" by studying an ARRL License Manual, or an AMECO Theory Course, and went in and took the test. You learned. Furthermore, I suggest that each class of license have specific learning objectives, which should be clearly defined.

Opinions?

--Robert WA3J

Date: Thu, 20 May 93 03:05:33 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!
amanda!robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Put up or Shut up!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> Well as I passed along to someone recently in an email message, why not
> first of all eliminate multiple choice written exams? I may be wrong on
> this, but I suspect that vast majority of VEs use or have access to PCs for
> test giving. At least in this area they almost all give elements 1A - 1C
> on a PC using SuperMorse. If that is the case, then why not use SuperMorse
> as an example and build a PC based test generator that generates
> fill-in-the-blank style tests and answer keys for the VE. SuperMorse
> already does this for Morse tests, i.e. has a template for a QSO and fills
> in actual values at QSO creation time. Certainly templates could be used
> for the written questions too. This would eliminate rote memorization of
> the written exam. If fill-in-the-blank style exams are too difficult for
> the VEs to grade, then fall back to multiple choice, but based upon
> templates and not fixed questions.
>
> The next thing I'd like to see is consolidating elements 1A - 1C with the
> written elements as proposed by Gary Coffman. Along with this, an
> increasing emphasis on the digital modes.

(yawn)

--Robert

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 09:44:27 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Put up or Shut up!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C7Asws.5My@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:

>little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:
>[Todd's fill in the blank stuff deleted, for now]
>:
>: The next thing I'd like to see is consolidating elements 1A - 1C with the

>: written elements as proposed by Gary Coffman. Along with this, an
>: increasing emphasis on the digital modes.
>:
>Gary,
> Care to elaborate? No kerosene please! :-)

It's really quite simple. Just integrate the 10 questions from the appropriate speed code element with the questions from the appropriate written element. Continue to require a total score of 70% for a passing grade. By removing code as a stand alone element, it's percentage of the total licensing requirement is reduced to that of any other mode or regulatory matter on the exam. If you're a code whiz, you can miss more AM questions and still pass. If you're a digital whiz, you can miss more code questions and still pass. I'd advocate beefing up the written exams in the process to more fully cover the various modes, but that's unrelated to the general idea of not giving code special treatment.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 20 May 93 12:10:35 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Put up or Shut up!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>this, but I suspect that vast majority of VEs use or have access to PCs for
>test giving.

i just don't want to have to lug a PC down to the school, when a tape recorder and the Koss wireless headphones are all i need to bring (and it's already enough to need a small hand truck as it is so one man can lug it all...)

>At least in this area they almost all give elements 1A - 1C
>on a PC using SuperMorse. If that is the case, then why not use SuperMorse
>as an example and build a PC based test generator that generates
>fill-in-the-blank style tests and answer keys for the VE. SuperMorse

ARRL/VEC has a program for this sort of thing - new version is due any time now...(hopefully, they aren't using a Microsoft Calendar to project delivery dates 8)).

>already does this for Morse tests, i.e. has a template for a QS0 and fills

>in actual values at QSO creation time. Certainly templates could be used
>for the written questions too.

got those -- a whole box of plastic overlays (something like 36 or 40 in all).
really speeds up the grading for written test. i'm more of a fan of changing
the content of the morse test to non-obvious communications - discussion the
score of a football game (get high school name, coach's name, location game
was played, etc.) instead of "R FB TNX FER RPLY BT NAME IS JOHN, AGE 32" sort
of tests in use today that follow the "cookie cutter" approach to QSOs. (well
at 5 wpm, it's tough to get complex...i'll concede that).

maybe something like:

n8abc de n9abc/2 r tn timer paula bt son dweezil played in school football game
tonite bt team won by 6 points after a passing freight train blew its
whistle bt the opponents left the field thinking the game was over bt
coach smithers showed real guts to go for it on 4th down es 32 yards to go
after losing so much yardage...

note the lack of clues like "is" and "the"...(hey, where's the pro-code guys
at? how come they aren't griping about the cookie cutter qso tests that seem
to be in wide use...?)

>This would eliminate rote memorization of the written exam.

huh? why? the questions have to come from the question pool....

>If fill-in-the-blank style exams are too difficult for
>the VEs to grade, then fall back to multiple choice, but based upon
>templates and not fixed questions.

8) i still have some non-multiple choice code test answer sheets....hummm...

bill wb9ivr

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 10:01:05 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Put up or Shut up!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May19.224732.29444@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>Well as I passed along to someone recently in an email message, why not
>first of all eliminate multiple choice written exams? I may be wrong on
>this, but I suspect that vast majority of VEs use or have access to PCs for
>test giving. At least in this area they almost all give elements 1A - 1C

>on a PC using SuperMorse. If that is the case, then why not use SuperMorse
>as an example and build a PC based test generator that generates
>fill-in-the-blank style tests and answer keys for the VE. SuperMorse
>already does this for Morse tests, i.e. has a template for a QSO and fills
>in actual values at QSO creation time. Certainly templates could be used
>for the written questions too. This would eliminate rote memorization of
>the written exam. If fill-in-the-blank style exams are too difficult for
>the VEs to grade, then fall back to multiple choice, but based upon
>templates and not fixed questions.

The problem with this approach, and the reason standardized tests use multiple choice, is that most questions can be answered with different words while still being correct. Thus the exam becomes subject to interpretation errors by the examiners. We see examples of these kinds of interpretation errors all the time here with people misunderstanding another's meaning. Multiple choice limits the chance of interpretation error by the examiners. The questions still have to be well written to prevent interpretation errors by the examinee, but that's easier because the question can be subject to widespread testing while an individual answer cannot.

The usual complaint about multiple choice exams is that the question pool can be easily memorized. The obvious solution to that problem is to make the question pool so large that memorization is more difficult than just learning the material. Keeping the answers private is not a solution because it allows no independent check on the fairness of the exam. Computers can be a help with managing large question pools. It's relatively easy to have a computer generate a new test for each applicant by drawing questions at random from each of the material groups to be covered.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 09:32:39 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May18.161633.28800@leland.Stanford.EDU>,

<1993May19.075511.16555@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993May19.190315.14206@leland.Stanford.EDU>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May19.190315.14206@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <1993May19.075511.16555@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>Most hams do have a finite amount of time to spend on the air. Therefore
>>the mode that conveys the most information in the least time is the most
>>useful to them.

>

>Using that as a premise, we quickly come to the conclusion that nobody
>should use anything other than voice. So, you've now doubled (or even
>tripled) the number of ops on HF, and they should all use SSB. You've
>just proven my point again.

No, I contend that your point is irrelevant. The Morse tests were not designed to relieve crowding. That may be a side effect on the HF Extra phone segments, but better, more relevant, ways of relieving crowding are available if that's the goal. Testing skills on an unrelated mode to achieve a side effect on a different mode is illogical, arbitrary, and capricious.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 09:10:45 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <DRXR4B3w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <1993May19.134443.19291@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993May19.185307.13745@leland.Stanford.EDU>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)

In article <1993May19.185307.13745@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <1993May19.134443.19291@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>I guess you don't read 73. Wayne claims high speed Morse causes brain
>>damage, thus Morsely impaired refers to high speed Morse addicts.

>

>Of course, there are those who would claim that as a former vice presidential
>candidate (and convicted tax evader), Wayne has a few mistuned IFs...;-)

Well, nobody is *perfect*. :-)

Anybody who's willing to take on the IRS *and* the Demopublicans can't be all bad however. Being in the right isn't always popular, or safe.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 10:51:11 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!emory!
wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C78nu2.HGv@news.iastate.edu>, <1993May19.065957.16039@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993May19.183536.12841@leland.Stanford.EDU>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: No Code Debate

In article <1993May19.183536.12841@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <1993May19.065957.16039@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>>There are three schools of thought among the proponents of continued
>>irrelevant manual Morse encoding testing.

>

>None of the arguments I've put forth fall into those three schools. I take
>it therefore that those arguments don't fall under the umbrella of "proponents
>of irrelevant manual Morse encoding"?

I think that deep down you fall into the third group. Your contentions
about Morse as a crowding filter are thin.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 12:33:27 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May17.174451.20242@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993May19.074459.16472@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993May19.184535.13332@leland.Stanford.EDU>V
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May19.184535.13332@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <1993May19.074459.16472@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>>As for experimental licenses, I held one. It's a useful license for some
>>things, but for techniques that require widespread testing, it's less
>>than ideal. The amateur license is *also* an experimental license, and
>>offers a much wider testing ground.

>

>So, how's the work on the cheap, public domain HF spread spectrum system
>coming?

>

>It's all nice and fine to advocate a system, but let's face it, it doesn't
>now exist, and nobody's working on it. I'd say that's because it's
>technically infeasible for the desired end user cost; there are plenty of
>similar examples which are analogous.

>

>But above all, unless you're willing to put in the free labor yourself, you're
>just offending those of us who already have.

It's true that I'm not working on HF SS at the moment, but neither are you.
Instead I'm continuing to work on a time compressed slotted simplex repeater
project at UHF with some bright no coders. It's only semi-wide, but has the
advantage of not requiring an STA or wide geographical cooperation. The AMRAD
work published in the SS Sourcebook already shows that cost is not a major
factor in HF SS. It's not even very challenging technically to understand.
The only things it needs to succeed are more participation, and a little
rules change. Those aren't likely to happen while the majority of HFers
remain "narrow-minded". :-)

BTW our little project has already shown some very positive side effects.
For example, the system automatically gives your distance from the simpeater
as a side effect of the slotting algorithm. You can also monitor your own
transmissions without need of a duplexer. There's never a need to ask for
signal reports. You can join various QSO "groups" from the front panel,
all using the same simplex channel. There's no coding gain over a standard
simplex connection, in fact there is some penalty, but the required resources

are small for the packing density achieved.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 10:49:32 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!emory!
wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May14.233610.329@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993May19.061012.15745@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993May19.180208.11885@leland.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May19.180208.11885@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <1993May19.061012.15745@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>

>>As to differing propagation, that's one of the advantages of HF. It
>>practically guarantees that *some* of the energy, on some band, will always
>>reach the destination.

>

>While this is true, it doesn't address the problem I'd indicated. With the
>variance in the F1/F2 layer height, the path length changes dramatically.
>Unless you have some apriori knowledge of those changes, you can't correlate
>them out. You also haven't explained how your going to make lots of cheap,
>stable clocks; again, if it was easy, GPS would be cheap. In general, you
>haven't addressed the problem of synchronization.

The path length changes aren't rapid with respect to symbol time. Tracking
algorithms are possible to follow the layers. Cheap stable clocks are also
not a problem unless you are using very high symbol rates below the gaussian
noise floor. That's not going to happen at HF. In the AMRAD experiments,
simple DPLL corrected clocks were used for SS voice. Initial lock is achieved
by sweeping the clock rate until synchronization is achieved by the DPLL.
After that, short term sync loss is handled by smoothing.

>While SS addresses fading and interference, it doesn't address signal
>strength, unless you plan to be all alone on the band. You also haven't
>dealt with the code allocation, or CQ problems.

Signal strength above the gaussian noise is rarely ever an issue at HF. HF noise is dominated by QRN and QRM. SS addresses that by putting it's energy where the noise is *not*. That's what spreading is all about, incoherent and spectrally randomly distributed noise doesn't add, coherent signals do. It's called "coding gain" as you know.

Code allocation is an interesting problem, much like TCP/IP addressing. And it can be handled the same way, by issuing sequences to stations. This has the benefit that CQ is no longer strictly needed, you can directly call a station by using his sequence. For cases when CQ is wanted, most SS systems designate a "calling channel" or sequence that is used only to establish contact and then switched away from as the stations exchange their assigned sequences. This is similar to the way trunked systems set up calls. There is even an evolving Federal standard for these automatic call setup protocols.

>>We already have, DSP systems are available for as little as \$199 today,
>>and prices continue to drop.
>
>The actual hardware cost is about \$30. Given a 100% profit margin, that
>means that 70% of the cost is in the software. Application software prices are
>going up, not down.

That's not clear. It depends on the size of the mass market for the product. In any event, prices are already below the pain threshold for most amateurs. People casually drop 3 times that amount for a HT that has Gameboy features. And that HT is considerably less useful.

>>Getting the *people* to do it *is* a problem, and is the problem being
>>addressed by the proposed licensing changes. By attracting more people who
>>are not brain washed by narrow thinking, it's possible we will get the
>>programming done.
>
>I'm sorry, but you have not demonstrated that the people who already have
>full access to HF aren't capable of doing what you say. I'm the author of
>a freeware Reed - Solomon coder (GNU ECC), and I don't think I've been
>"brainwashed" by anybody.

Well I think you have. :-) You continue to defend narrow modes exclusively in the face of the advantages offered by wide modes. FEC is useful, as useful for narrow as wide modes, but it's not particular to wide modes. I don't see you doing any PN spreading or frequency hopping algorithms. A couple of folks at AMRAD have, however, done some work under a limited STA. That work hasn't reached a critical mass. More people need to be involved to make it go. With the majority of HFers stuck in the 1950s, and testing stuck in the 19th century, there's been little activity in modern modes. (Neither packet nor Clover are really new. They use methods known to the

commercial and military worlds as long ago as WWII, though packet does use some channel sharing strategies developed by DARPA around 1970.) Where's the 1990s work? It's not being done at HF by coded amateurs stifled by fossilized thinking. (Unfortunately, not a lot is happening at UHF by newly minted no-coders either. But they're new, and I've already seen glimpses of new ideas coming from them.)

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #157
